



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

SOME NOTES TO MAHZOR YANNAI

THE following notes are in the nature of *Addenda et Corrigenda* to my edition of Mahzor Yannai.* Together with my own notes, I deem it proper to take under consideration some of the suggestions and corrections of the various reviewers of this book, as well as suggestions received in private communications. The notes are arranged in the order of the passages which are affected by them.

P. xii, note 18 : For the expression רצפי ינאי comp. *Gen. R.*, chap. 7 : חבטך רצוף רצפך where רצף has the meaning of דבר.

P. xvii : In regard to the Edict of Justinian against the study of 'Deuterosis', comp. now Krauss, *Studien zur byzantinisch-jüdischen Geschichte* (Vienna 1914), pp. 57-62.

Pp. xix-xx : As to the theory that the cryptic language of the Piyyutim was the result of persecution, I must admit that my language is in need of modification. In view of the objections raised by my reviewers¹ it seems to me much safer to assume with Zunz, that 'es gab damals, wie es im achten und neunten Jahrhundert ein künstliches Latein gab, einen einfachen und einen Kunststil, in Prosa wie in Poesie'.² This remark, which I as well as my critics overlooked, makes it unnecessary to stress the persecution theory too far.

* Mahzor Yannai. A liturgical work of the seventh century, edited from Genizah fragments, with notes and introduction by Israel Davidson, and additional notes by Louis Ginzberg. N.Y. 1919.

¹ Comp. Israel Abrahams in the *Jewish Guardian*, Jan. 2, 1920 ; also the communication of Professor Krauss, *ibid.*, March 26, and Dr. Abraham's reply, *ibid.*, April 2, as well as the note of A. Mishcon, *ibid.*, April 16. Comp. also I. Elbogen in *Z.f.H.B.*, XXII, 50-52, and B. Halper in מוקלט, vol. I, No. 4, pp. 141-5.

² *Synagogale Poesie*, p. 119. Comp. also Harkavy, זכרון לראשונים, v. p. 139, note 1.

Pp. xxi–xxiii: In connexion with the triennial cycle, reference should be made to Dr. Gaster's study, *The Biblical Lessons*, London, 1913. Whatever force there may be to his argument, that if the *Sedarim* stood in direct connexion with the public reading of the Torah in the Synagogue it is surprising that no graphic trace of such a division is found in any manuscripts of whatever age and place (p. 45), the Kerobot of Yannai are sufficient evidence to refute his oft-repeated statement that the *Sedarim* had no connexion whatsoever with the Liturgy (pp. 46, 54, 57, 73). The passage cited from שבלי הלקט likewise upsets his remark that no writer, excepting the author of the 'En Hakoreh', has identified this division with any liturgical purpose (pp. 53, 68, 72, 73). The close relationship of the *Sedarim* with the Liturgy is further confirmed by a series of eleven *Shib'atas*, preserved in the Bodleian MS. 2714, 6, which were expressly written for eleven corresponding *Sedarim* (Genesis, Nos. 20–30).³ Incidentally I may remark that the statement that 'no weekly lesson is known to begin in the middle of a section' (p. 44) meets with an exception in the weekly lesson ויחי. It is also not quite correct to say that it is rarely a סתומה which separates one weekly lesson from the other (p. 30), since there are 13 out of 53 (not counting ויחי just mentioned) which do.⁴

P. xxiv: Elbogen⁵ objects to my statement that Yannai's Kerobot were mainly halakic in character, because his *Shib'ata* for the New Year (Mahzor Yannai, p. 30) shows no trace of it. But perhaps this is one of the characteristic differences between a Kerobah and a *Shib'ata*, that the latter is haggadic while the former is halakic in character.

P. xxvii: The purpose of the חתימה is undoubtedly to comply with the talmudic dictum: כל הברכות צריך שיאמר מעין חתימתן סמוך (b. Pesahim 104 a). Ordinarily, this is complied with by such phrases as מלך עוזר ומושיע ומנן, or מלך ממית ומחיה and

³ In preparation for the *Schechter Studies*.

⁴ These are: ויצא, ויגש, וארא, בשלח, תצוה, ויקהל, פקודי, שמיני, בלק, ואתחנן, ראה, שופטים, תצא.

⁵ *l. c.*, pp. 51–2.

the like, but since the liturgic poems separate these phrases from the ends of their respective Benedictions, the חתימה is inserted in their stead. In making his 'conclusions' of three phrases each, Yannai perhaps followed the structure of the Eighteen Benedictions, most of which (4-16) consist of three clauses.⁶

P. xxviii : Further corroboration that ואתה קדוש אל נא was used as a rubric and that the insertion of the phrase יושב תהלות ישראל is a corruption of later times may be found in the fact that in the Kerobah of Kalir, published in the Zunz *Jubelschrift* (p. 202), there is likewise no word between ואתה קדוש and אל נא. The editor inserted dots as if to indicate 'an omission, but Firkowitz' copy of the MS, from which it was published, and which is now in the library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, shows no trace of any dots, or any omission.

P. xxxii, note 59 : The opinion as to the authorship of אל נא לעולם תוערין, cited here in the name of Rapoport, was already expressed some years previously by Luzzatto.⁷

P. xxxiv, l. 3 : It should be stated here, that the sixth part of the Kerobah is usually headed by the word אחד.

P. xxxvii : The poem דר מתוחים אדיר occurs in מחזור רומניא (Const. 1574, fol. 70 b) as a Yozer.

P. xlvi : Read with Halper⁸ וגינת. Comp. also Judah Halevi's verse :⁹ נבלי וכנורי בפי עמי גני ופרדסי ספריה.

HEBREW PART, p. 2, l. 5 : Read מחלה ראש (Halper).

P. 5, l. 38 : Read ובבוהק.

P. 6, l. 4 : Halper suggests that זמם has the meaning of גידים, veins, and refers to the expression נחתי נחקי, which is rather a novel interpretation of Job 17. 11.

P. 8, l. 20 : Brody suggests¹⁰ that the rhyme requires the reading כאש צרבת במכה.

⁶ Comp. also *Jewish Enc.* XI. 278.

⁷ Comp. *המניד*, V, 149.

⁸ *l.c.*, p. 145.

⁹ It is the last verse of the poem beginning איך אפחדה מאיש, which was erroneously ascribed to Samuel Ha-Nagid. Comp. Harkavy, *זכרון לראשונים*, I, p. 154.

¹⁰ In a private communication of March 9, 1920.

l. 22 : Read בעון בצעו הכהו מחץ פצעו (Brody).

P. 9, l. 34 : Read חשובים במיתים (Poznański)¹¹.

P. 15, l. 31 : Read דולף הוא צינים (Idem).

l. 36 : The rhyme requires that איווה be transferred from l. 36 b to 36 a. Read ליבם איווה חסר, שאר אשר חסר (Idem).

P. 17, l. 61 b : Read יעופש (Brody).

P. 20, l. 22 : Read רמי ירושלים הדיה (Brody and Halper).

P. 22, l. 40 b : Read אות לטובה בניה מרובים (Brody).

P. 23, l. 4 b : Read בחובה ולא רשות (Idem).

P. 24, l. 14 : Read פתע גוע (Brody and Poznański). Brody justly remarks that the phrase הוא מת מצוה is an explanatory marginal note on the preceding phrase, which crept into the body of the text.

P. 27, l. 19 b : Read ועולות שלמים, comp. p. 28, l. 25 (Brody).

P. 32, note 1 : Further proof of Rapoport's suggestion that this Kerobah was intended for the first day of Passover may be adduced from the fact that the first biblical verse cited is Exod. 12. 29, showing that the Kerobah was composed in connexion with the biblical lesson assigned for that day (see Mahzor Yannai, p. xxvi, § 1). The original heading of this Kerobah, therefore, undoubtedly read : קדושתא ויהי בחצי הלילה.

P. 35, note 16 : Comp. *Gen. R.*, chap. 50 : א"ר לוי אין הקב"ה דן את אר"ה אלא בלילה בשעה שישנים מן העבירות ואינו דן את ישראל דן את אר"ה אלא ביום בשעה שעסוקין במצות (Poznański). Comp. also the references in Theodor *ad loc.*

P. 37, l. 9 : On account of the rhyme read : בבכורות. ירך עשתה. בשכורות. תשע מכות (Brody).

P. 41, note 1 : The word דרמוש is not a synonym of שבעתא, but of רהוטא. It is the Greek *δρόμος*, meaning 'runner'. Comp. Zunz, *Syn. Poesie*, p. 69, and *Litg.*, p. 24, note 4 ; Brody and Albrecht, *שער השיר*, p. 19. It should also be noted here that the word לרמוש, which Wertheimer puts in the heading of this poem,

¹¹ Comp. *המזרחי* vol. II, Nos. 2-4 ; reprinted in *העברי*, vol. X, Nos. 9-10.

is according to a photograph of MS. 2708 r., from which he published it, nowhere to be found.

In conclusion I may state that through the suggestion of Dr. Brody of Prague, I came upon further liturgies of Yannai in the Oxford MS. Or. 2714⁵ (Heb. d. 41). This MS. contains a Kerobah for the Sabbath falling within the week of Passover and a *Shib'ata* for the same day. Of the Kerobah only the end of part VII and parts VIII and IX have been preserved. It also contains a Kerobah by Yannai for the second day of Passover, besides liturgies of Samuel, who is very likely identical with Samuel 'the third'. All of these are in preparation for the *Schechter Studies*.

ISRAEL DAVIDSON.

Jewish Theological Seminary of America.